DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 046 HE 012 241

AUTHOR Feldman, Reynold
TITLE The Educated Person in Cross-Cultural Perspective. Implications for the Postsecondary Educational Planner. UMHE Monograph Series, No. 4.
INSTITUTION United Ministries in Higher Education, Valley Forge, Pa.
REPORT NO UMHE-4
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 12p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Society for College and University Planning (13th, Hollywood, FL, July 31, 1978)
AVAILABLE FROM United Ministries in Education, Educational Ministries, ABC, Valley Forge, PA 19481 ($1.00; $0.50 each for 10 or more)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS College Planning; Continuous Learning; Cross Cultural Studies; *Cultural Factors; *Cultural Traits; Definitions; *Educational Objectives; Foreign Countries; *Futures (of Society); Global Approach; *Higher Education; Models; Non Western Civilization; Western Civilization
IDENTIFIERS China (Ancient); India; Peoples Republic of China

ABSTRACT

Five distinct images of the educated person are examined: the well-educated American (representing the Western world), the Indian guru or yogi, the Confucian scholar or Mandarin, the socialist comrade from the People's Republic of China, and the "new human being" (a futuristic view of the holistically educated person). These concepts are discussed in the context of the literature of the various cultures. Implications for the postsecondary education planner are noted: (1) educators and their charges need to be clear about the goals of educational programs; (2) an education based on a monocultural formulation of the past is no longer adequate nor appropriate; (3) education is a process that cannot be contained in a single set or type of institution; (4) to be wholly rather than partially educated means focusing on and attaining many goals, one at a time; and (5) students can be encouraged to pursue lifelong learning goals beyond the emphasis and scope of intellectually-oriented universities. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183046

UMHE

Monograph

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

United Ministries in H.E.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 012 241

THE EDUCATED PERSON IN CROSS-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE
Implications for the Postsecondary Educational Planner

Reynold Feldman

Reynold Feldman is Director of Program Development at Northeastern Illinois University in Chicago. *This paper was presented at the 13th Annual Conference of the Society for College and University Planning, July 31, 1978, in Hollywood Florida.*

April 1979 *Number 4*

UMHE Monograph Series
Editor: Dr. John Hiemstra

Published by
UMHE Communication Office

Culture acts as a set of blinders, or series of lenses, through which men view their environments. . . . The skills that are acquired, the factual knowledge, the basic assumptions, the values, and the tastes, are largely determined by culture.

Clyde Kluckholm and Henry A. Murray [1]

One of the functions of culture is to provide a highly selective screen between man and the outside world. In its many forms, culture therefore designates what we pay attention to and what we ignore.

Edward T. Hall [2]

Shuzan held up his staff and waved it before his monks. "If you call this a staff," he said, "you deny its eternal truth. If you do not call this a staff, you deny its present fact. Tell me, just what do you propose to call it?"

Zen Buddhist anecdote [3]

Each culture and civilization has its ideal of the educated person which its educational institutions endeavor to produce. Universities in the Western world, for instance, are ultimately institutional responses to such ideals as the clerical scholastic, the Renaissance man, the Christian gentleman, the well-rounded individual, and the specialist. Education in China, by contrast, has variously espoused the Confucian scholar, the new socialist man, and most recently the technical expert. India stands out for its commitment to spiritual self-realization as the goal of the truly educated human being—a commitment more honored, perhaps, by Maharishi International University in Iowa than by many British-influenced universities on the subcontinent itself. Still, the paradigm exists.

During times of relative cultural stability, the question of what it means to be an educated person scarcely arises. For one thing, individuals are trained to perform the functions of a well-defined and accepted station in society. (Please note that the very word *station* suggests stasis.)

But these are hardly stable times, and yesterday's assumptions are quickly becoming today's questions. Thus in its editorial of May 9, 1978, on the newly revised undergraduate curriculum at Harvard College, the *Chicago Tribune* begins by asking, "What does it mean to be an educated person?" In his seminal report for 1975-1976, Harvard Dean Henry Rosovsky raised the issue in these terms:

> At every Commencement, the President of Harvard University welcomes new graduates of the College "to the company of educated men and women." Having witnessed this ceremony for many years, I must confess to an increasing sense of unease with the phrase. A bachelor's degree may signify little more than the satisfactory completion of a fixed number of undergraduate courses. It is a matter of simple observation that not all college graduates are educated persons, nor are all educated persons necessarily college graduates. [4]

As Burton J. Bledstein points out, "In every historical era, the curriculum of American higher education has tended to reflect the more deeply held values of American society. . . . By and large, schools have institutionalized the social values of the American middle class, and educators have given form to these cultural commitments in the curriculum. Yet, what seems missing from the current debate about general education are these very philosophical premises that have been at the heart of previous discussions."[5] Therefore, as educational institutions begin to follow Harvard, Emory, and the California State colleges and universities, among others, down the winding path of curriculum revision and reform, it is altogether fitting that we ourselves go back to basics and consider what it is that we wish our students to learn or, even more, to become. What, in short, is the educated person?

In approaching such a culture-laden topic, we would do well to learn from our colleagues in anthropology that while binding us together in a community of shared meanings and assumptions, culture can also blind us to the ultimate realities about ourselves and others. As Hall suggests, it is almost a matter of where we are unconsciously trained to put our attention. Thus, as Shuzan-*sensai* demonstrates, if we concentrate on the "eternal truth" of the staff, we deny it its reality as a walking stick, and vice versa.

For the purpose of this paper, therefore, I shall hold up the mirror to ourselves by briefly examining five distinct images of the educated person: the well-educated American (representative of the Western world), the Indian guru or yogi, the Confucian scholar or Mandarin, the socialist comrade from the People's Republic of China, and what I shall call for lack of a better term "the new human being." This sort of paradigmatic comparison is not altogether original. In 1965, for example, two books took a somewhat similar tack: Robert Ulich's *Education in Western Culture*,[6] where some of the chapter titles read, "The Middle Ages: Education for Hierarchy"; "Humanism and the Renaissance: Education for Individuality"; "The Seventeenth Century: Education for Communion"; and Nash, Kazamias, and Perkinson's *The Educated Man: Studies in the History of Educational Thought*,[7] where various types are illustrated, e.g., the Guardian—Plato, the Stoic—Zeno, the Classical Humanist—Erasmus, the Gentleman—Locke, the Natural Man—Rousseau, the Communal Man—Marx, etc. Without exception, however, both these works deal with the Western tradition only, and different though Rousseau may seem from Locke within that tradition, their similarities become apparent in comparison with images of the educated person deriving from India and China. In 1968, I myself delivered a paper to the Mortar Board Honor Society at the University of Hawaii in Honolulu entitled, "College and the Hereafter: On the Limits of Western Education."[8] It suggested that in education different cultures and traditions tend to emphasize different aspects of the indi-

vidual for development. For example, Sparta trained the body, Israel the character, the mystics the soul, the post-Renaissance West the intellect, etc. To some extent, the present paper, ten years later, is a reworking of the same material in a new context. At any rate, by now examining five rather distinct images, I hope to lend a useful multi-cultural perspective to our current curricular debate.

The Educated Person in the Western World (The American Conception)

"In a pluralistic society," Paul L. Dressel writes, "one can scarcely expect—indeed it is probably undesirable—to find unanimity in educational philosophy."[9] Nevertheless, a cross-cultural analysis reveals a common assumption at the base of contemporary American (and Western) higher education—the centrality of the human intellect. The current jogging craze notwithstanding, our conception of Horace's *mens sana in corpore sano* clearly emphasizes the strong mind at the expense of the strong body. Required physical education courses are thus a thing of the past. In comparison with Spartan education, moreover, military schooling at any level is for us an activity of the few, not the many. Military service is in fact voluntary, with recruits frequently enlisting because of the promise of inexpensive *academic* benefits.

In *The New Learning in America*, Robert Maynard Hutchins is very clear on the point that the educated person is primarily a *knower*:

> An educated man knows what he is doing and why. It is possible, I suppose, to be a very good cook without knowing chemistry. At least the cookbooks confine themselves to telling you what to do under certain circumstances. It is not yours to reason why; you follow the instructions. It is perhaps for this reason that cooking has never been regarded as one of the learned professions. . . . The subject matter of a learned profession is intellectual. Though the rules of the trade may be learned in the practice, and indeed can only be learned there, the intellectual content of the profession can generally be mastered only in the university; at least a university should be the ideal place for such study.[10]

Or in case that statement isn't clear enough, Hutchins goes on to say, "A student may, then, enter a professional school without ever having been compelled to think, without, in short, being educated."[11] The job of the university, therefore, is to instill "the intellectual virtues . . . habits resulting from the training of the intellectual powers. An intellect properly disciplined, an intellect properly habituated, is an intellect able to operate well in all fields. An education that consists of the cultivation of the intellectual virtues, therefore, is the most useful education, whether the student is destined for a life of contemplation or a life of action."[12]

One may object, however, that Hutchins is too intellectually oriented and therefore an unfair examplar of higher education in the West. Let us skip, then, to Benjamin S. Bloom's influential *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*, published twenty years later in 1956.[13] It is worth noting that Handbook I deals with the "Cognitive Domain." Bloom's famous "classification of educational goals," moreover, includes (1) knowledge, (2) comprehension, (3) application, (4) analysis, (5) synthesis, and (6) evaluation. Or let us turn, finally, to Theodore A. Gross's "How to Kill a College: The Private Papers of a Campus Dean," which appeared in the February 4, 1978 *Saturday Review*. Gross concludes:

> Inevitably, one returns in education to the basic questions of what a student *knows* upon graduation and especially of what skills of interpretation he possesses. If he does not know something of philosophy and history; if he has not developed the critical skills that enable him to distinguish the moral from the immoral, flatulent language from genuine, art from artifact—then he is not educated. Discrimination is essential: intellectual discrimination. That and lengthening the critical attention span, so atomized by television and radio and newspapers and a hundred forces colliding with the eye and the ear. And acquiring the understanding of a few great texts—a few will suffice—that have lived beyond their moment in time. And achieving the self-reliance that grows from the authority of knowing some things well.[14]

I give these three examples not because I disagree with their positions, but rather because I find these positions, as our curricula themselves, to be such clear reflections of the *intellectual* bias our culture has given its definition of the educated person. Later, in the section on "the new human being," I shall consider several less mainstream American writers who, among others, are attempting to expand our definition of *homo educatus* beyond the cognitive domain.

The Educated Person of Classical India "The Man of Steady Mind"

A friend of mine at the East-West Center in Honolulu believes that if an American wants to experience culture shock most strongly, he or she should spend time in India. This friend knows whereof he speaks, since he himself, as an East-West Center grantee in the early '60s, left years of teaching social studies at a Brooklyn high school for an extensive field stay on the subcontinent. He later returned to India in an attempt to understand what he had experienced during the first trip, and now, years later, he is still trying to make sense of that "other world" which so radically changed his life.

It is therefore fitting that we next consider the image of the educated person in classical India—a type so distinct from the this-world oriented Western scholar as to require a special explanation if not an apology. Thus Robert Ulich writes: "Since nature and humanity are reflections of the divine will, the Indian is inclined to believe in a hierarchical and static society which man must not try to change arbitrarily. When the order of society is disturbed it can be restored only through man's return to the divine sources of life. Change of mind is the only effective form of revolution."[15]

Now in this context, if one cites a single passage from a classical Hindu text, say the *Hitopadesa*, to the effect that "Among all things knowledge, they say, is truly the best thing,"[16] the contrast with our concept of the educated person is not apparent. Yet if one pursues what the Hindu tradition means by *knowledge*, the distinction becomes striking. Consider, for example, this verse from the *Khandogya Upanishad:* "Those who depart from hence without having discovered the Self [note capital S] and those true desires, for them there is no freedom in all the worlds. But those who depart from hence, after having discovered the Self and those true desires, for them there is freedom in all the worlds."[17] A clearer understanding of *knowledge* for the classical Hindu can be found in the *Ordinances of Manu*, Lecture II, where we read: "A learned man, having viewed by the eye of knowledge all this complete system as according to the authority of revelation, should certainly be firm in his own *dharma* [destined mission on earth; duty]. For a man performing the *dharma* declared by revelation and tradition obtains fame here, and after his death extreme happiness."[18]

But what is the "learned man" and how does he "view by the eye of knowledge"? The answer, "declared by revelation and tradition," is given the noble warrior Arjuna by his charioteer, the incognito god Krishna, in a famous section of the *Bhagavad-Gita.* Arjuna (Ch. II, v. 54) has just asked Krishna for a description of "the man of steady mind"—literally the "one who has firmly established wisdom" or the "man of stabilized mentality."[19] Krishna responds as follows:

> When a man abandons all the desire of his mind . . . and is satisfied in his self by the self alone, then he is called a man of steady mind.
>
> He whose mind is not troubled in sorrow, and has no desire in pleasure, his passion, fear and anger departed, he is called a steady-minded sage.
>
> He who is not attached to anything, who neither delights nor is upset when he obtains good or evil, his mind is firmly established (in wisdom).
>
> And when he comletely withdraws his senses from the objects of sense, as a tortoise draws in his limbs, his mind is firmly established.
>
> The objects of sense, but not the taste for them, falls away from the embodied soul who abstains from food. Even the taste for them falls away from him when the Supreme is seen.
>
> The excited senses of even a wise man who strives (for perfection) . . . violently carry away his mind.
>
> Having restrained them all, he should sit disciplined, intent on Me; for his mind is firmly set whose senses are under control.
>
> When a man dwells on the objects of sense, attachment to them is produced. From attachment desire arises, and from desire anger comes.
>
> From anger arises delusion, from delusion loss of memory, from loss of memory the destruction of intelligence, and from the destruction of intelligence, he perishes.
>
> But he who moves among the objects of sense, with the senses under control and is free from desire and aversion, he who is thus self-controlled attains serenity of mind.
>
> And in that serenity, the destruction of all pain is produced for him. The intelligence of the man of tranquil mind is quickly established.
>
> For the uncontrolled, there is no intelligence, nor for the uncontrolled is there concentration; and without concentration there is no peace, and for the unpeaceful, how can there be happiness?
>
> When the mind hastens after the roving senses, it carries along the understanding, as wind carries away a ship on the waters.
>
> Therefore . . . his intelligence is firmly established whose senses are completely withdrawn from the objects of sense.
>
> What is night for all being is the time of waking for the man of self-control, and when all beings are awake, that is night for the sage who sees.
>
> He attains peace into whom all desires flow as waters into the sea which, though ever being filled, is ever motionless; and not he who lusts after desires.
>
> He who abandons all desires and acts without longing, without self-interest or egotism, he attains peace.
>
> This is the eternal state . . . having attained it, one is no longer confused. Fixed in it even at the time of death, one attains to the bliss of Brahman.[20]

The educated person in the classical Hindu tradition is thus "the man of steady mind," the guru or sage who, through the practices of yoga and meditation, has learned to sever his attachment to the objects of sense which, according to the *Gita*, is the root cause of egotism, self-interest, and the accompanying passions. The curriculum implied by Krishna is, to be sure, a far cry from Harvard's, whether before or after the Rosovsky reforms, and the end-product someone rather different from Henry Kissinger. The pay-offs, moreover, transcend this life but purportedly contribute to the individual's well-being and happiness in this life as well as "at the time of death" and beyond. *Knowledge* is thus intended as self-transforming mystical knowledge, or *gnosis*, which is of an entirely different order from the factual knowledge, critical—or scientifically skeptical—attitude, and specialized expertise which characterize the educated person in Western tradition, above all in the last few centuries.

The Educated Person in Old China

Of the three great traditions which helped to form the educated individual in Old—pre-communist—China, i.e., the Taoist, Confucianist, and Buddhist, one—the Confucianist—was clearly preeminent. As an indication, persons in the People's Republic are never criticized for being Lao-Tzes or Buddhas, yet it is a common occurrence for a non-conforming comrade to be publicly denounced as a Confucius. Confucius, then, and his teachings guided the development of the educated person in China for nearly 2,500 years. Consequently, this section shall be devoted in the main to sketching the image of the educated person as Confucian.

Taoism, although it eventually degenerated into superstition-ridden ritualism, was originally a mystical way not unlike those of hinduism, sufism, and the other examplars of the "Perennial Philosophy." Several verses from the *Tao Teh King*, principal Taoist scripture, make this point clear:

> Without going outside his door, one understands all that takes place under the sky; without looking out from his window, one sees the Tao of Heaven. The farther that one goes out from himself, the less he knows.
>
> Therefore the sages got their knowledge without travelling; gave their right names to things without seeing them; and accomplished their ends without any purpose of doing so.[21]

Ulich distinguishes the teachings of Confucius from those of Lao-Tse with the remark that for Confucius "education is primarily a means of preserving society," whereas for Lao-Tse education is more of a "contemplative nature. . . . The Confucius type lays stress on the good citizen, the Lao-Tse type on the spirit which *makes* a good man."[22] Or, in a completely different context, Fitzrof Capra in *The Tao of Physics* writes: "Confucianism was generally emphasized in the education of children who had to learn the rules and conventions necessary for life in society, whereas Taoism used to be pursued by older people in order to regain and develop the original spontaneity which had been destroyed by social conventions."[23] But perhaps the clearest distinction can be found, again, in the *Tao Teh King* itself, where we read: "He who devotes himself to learning seeks from day to day to increase his knowledge; he who devotes himself to the Tao seeks from day to day to diminish his doing."[24]

Confucius and his followers, by contrast, were determined to increase their knowledge for the very purpose of increasing and improving their doing. According to Rena Foy, "the body of educational ideas that has come to be called Confucian . . . had as its ultimate goal the creation of a moral social order. However, the moral social order envisioned by Confucius could not be brought about merely by rearranging processes of government or law enforcement; it was directly dependent upon the education of the self-disciplined moral individual."[25] Although there is a similar focus on the individual in the *Gita's* description of "the man of steady mind," the worldly benefits emphasized in this classic passage from Confucius's *Great Learning* has a totally different flavor:

> The ancients who wished to illustrate illustrious virtue throughout the empire, first ordered well their own States. Wishing to order well their States, they first regulated their families. Wishing to regulate their families, they first cultivated their persons. Wishing to cultivate their persons, they first rectified their hearts. Wishing to rectify their hearts, they first sought to be sincere in their thoughts. Wishing to be sincere in their thoughts, they first extended to the utmost their knowledge. Such extension of knowledge lay in the investigation of things.
>
> Things being investigated, knowledge became complete. Their knowledge complete, their thoughts were sincere. Their thoughts being sincere, their hearts were then rectified. Their hearts being rectified, their persons were cultivated. Their persons being cultivated, their families were regulated. Their families being regulated, their States were rightly governed. Their States being rightly governed, the whole empire was made tranquil and happy.[26]

The classical Hindu version of the educated person, moreover, was limited to members of the Brahman (priestly) or, at the furthest, the Kshatriya (warrior) castes. (Arjuna himself was a member of the second—a nobleman.) Yet as Foy points out, "The superior man of Confucian thought was to be created through an educational, not hereditary, process. While rank and gradation were believed to be essential to social order, the degree of cultivation of the Tao (the Way—a habit of virtuous thought and action) should enable man to progress from a lowly station to a higher one."[27]

To achieve "the ultimate educational aim of the moral order composed of moral men,"[28] Confucius strived to develop individuals dedicated to knowledge, self-critical yet self-respecting, in whom a sense of duty was inculcated, for whom good conduct toward others was habitual, who appreciated poetry, ritual, and music, and who served as a good example—or role model—for others.[29] "Morality practiced in family relationships was the best assurance of morality in the political life of the society. Confucius enumerated ten human duties: kindness in the father, filial piety in the son, gentility in the elder brother, humility and respect in the younger brother, good behavior in the husband, obedience in the wife, benevolence in the elders, obedience in the juniors, benevolence in the ruler, and loyalty in the ministers."[30]

This then was the image of the educated person in Old China—a learned, genteel, dutiful scholar-*cum*-public official, long practiced in *Li*, the ten Confucian virtues, whereby he had achieved the status of being educated. The word *Mandarin*, according to the Oxford Universal Dictionary, comes from the Sanskrit *mantrin* (counsellor) and ultimately derives from the root *man*, to think. In fact, however, the Confucian Mandarin was more a person cultivated to follow etiquette than a thinker in the Western sense. Yet the Chinese, like all other culture groups in the history of humankind, were not beyond ethnocentrism. As Harry Lindquist remarks, "Civilization was identified in the Chinese tradition with being educated in the Confucian manner. Anyone who had not been so educated lacked civilization and was therefore a 'barbarian.'"[31]

The Educated Person in the People's Republic of China

The more things change, the more they remain the same. The late Chairman Mao Tse-tung and his followers endeavored to create a new socialist individual who, collectively, would comprise and thus bring into being a New China. Like Confucius, Mao knew that the foundation of the state,

even a Communist state, ultimately lay with the individual. Once political conquest of the mainland had been accomplished, the inevitable next step was thus to revolutionize the hearts and minds of the people. This, then, was the origin of the Cultural Revolution. As Philippe Devillers wrote in 1969, "The aim of the cultural revolution was therefore to the revolutionize and remold the Chinese people, a titanic undertaking which was both a struggle against human nature and a race against time, because results had to be obtained *before* the new generations, those who had not experienced the 'warlords' or the civil war or the Japanese invasion, were deterred by the huge task which remained to be completed by some 'Krushchevite' form of evolution."[32] On the other hand, some of the values which Mao was trying to instill were perhaps not altogether foreign to the Chinese mentality. Based on his trip to the People's Republic in 1972, William Kessen, Chairman of Psychology at Yale, reported:

> Chinese teachers seem to have little awareness of how much in the behavior of children that they assign to Communist ideology is rather the continuation of centuries-old tradition. Can it be that, unlike those of the Soviet Union and Western Europe, the traditions of child-rearing in China are in neat congruence with the aims of Communist state-building? After all, restraint, respect for authority, intricate bureaucracies, and calm pleasantness are not inventions of the Communist leadership; they are old China in a new five-button jacket.[33]

Nonetheless, one key to the distinctiveness of Mao's New Socialist Man is that he/she is not part of a select group, a Mandarin elite, but is meant to include everyone. Consequently, as Chiu-San Tsang writes in *Society, Schools and Progress in China*, "Education, de-education and re-education take place in other institutions besides those of education and culture. They take place in the social, economic, and political institutions as well, such as the family, religion, customs, the communes, factories, production agencies, the Liberation Army, workers' unions, governmental offices, neighborhood organizations, and so forth. Since the new social order has to be established with this new ideology of the proletariat, no institution can be spared from use and no person can escape conformity. . . . In a real sense . . . the whole country is turned into a huge school with Mao Tse-tung as its great tutor. In this sense, education is life, real life, and the most embracing form of life."[34]

What, then, is this new person that Mao and his colleagues have endeavored to produce? Mao describes him thus:

> A Communist should be frank, faithful and active, looking upon the interests of the revolution as his very life and subordinating his personal interests to those of the revolution; he should, always and everywhere, adhere to correct principles and wage a tireless struggle against all incorrect ideas and actions so as to consolidate the collective life of the Party and strengthen the ties between the Party and the masses; and he should be more concerned about the Party and the masses than about the individual, and more concerned about others than about himself. Only thus can he be considered a Communist.[35]

But how to bring about this quasi-Christian concern for others? Harry Lindquist explains a major strategy: "The national goal of making intellectuals familiar with the rigors and experiences of manual labor is evident. . . . Gardening and physical education are becoming basic parts of a person's education in present-day China. This is a real departure from the traditional assumption of a strict division between men of learning and men of labor. One important factor in the recent Cultural Revolution was the desire of the regime to prevent continuation of the old Chinese distinction between intellectual and worker which has led to classes being formed along those lines."[36] Indeed, as Mao often said, his efforts were simply to enact what Marx and Lenin had already laid down. Lenin, for example, had emphasized that "every day in every village, in every city, the young should actually perform some task of social labor, be it ever so small, be it ever so simple."[37] Mao himself put the matter this way in "Bookish Knowledge and Practice" (February 1, 1942):

> How can those who have only book-learning be turned into intellectuals in the true sense? The only way is to get them to take part in practical work and become practical workers, to get those engaged in theoretical work to study important practical problems. In these ways our aim can be attained. . . . [For] there are two kinds of incomplete knowledge, one is ready-made knowledge found in books and the other is knowledge that is mostly perceptual and partial: both are one-sided. Only the integration of the two can yield knowledge that is sound and relatively complete.[38]

To bring about this integration, Mao devised one of the most interesting innovations of his long career, the May Seventh school. Named after his famous directive issued on May 7, 1966, this institution was not only to create "intellectuals in the true sense," but to eliminate the age-old bureaucratism seemingly endemic to China. Stephen Uhalley, Jr., comments in *Mao Tse-tung* (1975):

> Here, professionals and administrative cadres were encouraged to go beyond the study and practice of their own professional pursuits, and "to raise levels of education and to engage in agriculture and side-occupations, to run small or medium-sized factories, to engage in mass work, and to participate in the struggles to criticize and repudiate the bourgeoisie." The schools were built from scratch, usually in very hard or marginal terrain. They were built by the students . . . [who] made the soil yield crops, usually with the advice and help of neighboring peasants, and eventually made themselves largely self-sufficient. As the schools prospered, the students constructed small factories to manufacture products of use in the local economy. Aside from such productive labor, the students spent much of their time in political study. The length of assignments . . . varied . . . but normally a student could expect to spend three to six months. . . . The system seemed to work, at least in places observed by many visiting foreigners. The exercise served the purpose of maintaining and improving political responsiveness, cultivating an appreciation for the value of physical labor and of what life is like for those who do such work on a permanent basis, raising the level of health of those who tended to work at desks all the time, and deterring officious behavior.

> The newly designed government structure was staffed by rededicated and reinvigorated personnel. Bureaucracy, its merits and its evils, have had a long experience in China. It is said too that undue bureaucratization is one of the major problems of other socialist block countries. Clearly, no other Communist leadership has done more to deal with the problem.[39]

The ideal educated person in the context of the People's Republic of China is therefore a public servant who has learned to put the interests of others, the Party, and the people, above his own; who has integrated book-learning with personal experience and work; and who has acquired empathy with manual laborers through intermittent stints of productive, socially relevant labor at a May Seventh school. For the New China to become a reality, finally, it is necessary that all Chinese eventually approximate this ideal, or, in Mao's terms, become true Communists.

The Holistically Educated Person—Towards a New Human Being

In the April 1978 *Futurist*, Ronald E. Barnes made a useful distinction among the terms "education," "learning," and "schooling": "An education," he writes, "is what each of us will have when we draw our last breath, learning is a process by which we acquire that education, and schooling is only one part of that process."[40] The educated person, by implication, is one who, with high efficiency and little waste, has turned the base metal of life experience into the gold of skills, understanding, and wisdom. The various *integrative* movements in education are thus, in various ways, aimed at producing a more fully and completely educated person than the Western intellectual researcher/scholar produced by our graduate schools. We read further in Part I, Section 131 of Public Law 94-482—the Lifelong Learning Act—that

> (2) the American people need lifelong learning to enable them to adjust to social, technological, political and economic changes;
>
> (3) lifelong learning has a role in developing the potential of all persons including improvement of their personal well-being, upgrading their workplace skills, and preparing them to participate in the civic, cultural, and political life of the Nation;
>
> (4) lifelong learning is important in meeting the needs of the growing number of older and retired persons;
>
> (5) learning takes place through formal and informal instruction, through educational programs conducted by public and private educational and other institutions and organizations, through independent study, and through the efforts of business, industry, and labor. . . .[41]

In short, the new educated person is a self-educating individual for whom the context is life itself and the institution at best a facilitator of, at worst an obstacle to, the process.

But if education is co-extensive with the whole of life, there is another and perhaps more important way in which it is holistic; namely, it concerns itself with the entire human person. Thus, the February 1978 *Matrix/CLE* lists as one of the "demonstrable results of liberal education" that "the person will appreciate his/her wholeness and know that she/he can be reduced neither to any one social role, nor to the sum of all social roles."[42] Or, according to the authors of *Gandhi and America's Educational Future*, Gandhi defined education as "an all-round drawing out of the best in child and man—body, mind and spirit."[43] Gandhi's countryman, Jiddu Krishnamurti, is somewhat less abstract:

> We must be very clear in ourselves what we want, clear what a human being must be—the total human being, not just the technological human being. If we concentrate very much on examinations, on technological information, on making the child clever, proficient in acquiring knowledge, while we neglect the other side, then the child will grow up into a one-sided human being. When we talk about the total human being, we mean not only a human being with inward understanding, with a capacity to explore, to examine his inward being, his inward state and the capacity of going beyond it, but also someone who is good in what he does outwardly. The two must go together. That is the real issue in education—to see that when the child leaves the school, he is well established in goodness, both outwardly and inwardly.[44]

Earlier I promised to mention several Western writers who also see a complete education as transcending the cognitive domain. In *Learning to Feel—Feeling to Learn: Humanistic Education for the Whole Man* (1971), Harold C. Lyon, Jr., writes:

> What this book is trying to say is that isolating cognitive learning from affective learning is a mistake. . . . It's a mistake which has created a large number of intellectual "half-men," brilliantly developed, perhaps, on the intellectual end of the continuum, but severly lacking on the feeling or affective end. . . . The healthy individual in the 1970s hopefully will be somewhere in the middle ground. . . . He or she will be able to deal with feelings and intellectual matters.[45]

Recent physiological research relating to the differing right- and left-brain functions likewise lends weight to the humanistic psychologists and anthropologists advocating holistic human development. In the March 1976 *Current Anthropology*, Paredes and Hepburn conclude: "Certain researches in psychobiology tentatively indicate that the hemispheres of the brain are not functional duplicates, nor is one hemisphere simply an inadequate version of the other, but rather the hemispheres manifest two distinct systems of information processing."[46]

In the Western tradition, postsecondary education emphasizes developing the left-hand cerebral hemisphere, the organ for processing information in a logical, cognitive manner. Biologist Robert S. DeRopp, in *The Master Game* (1968), consequently criticizes universities as "huge, highly specialized centers . . . obviously lacking in universality."

> They educate only a small part of man's totality. They cram the intellectual brain with facts, pay some lip service to the education of the physical body by encouraging idiotic competitive sports. But true education in the sense of expansion of consciousness and the harmonious development of man's latent powers, they do not offer.[47]

In 1953, UNESCO organized an international roundtable discussion on Humanism and Education in East and West. Distinguished participants from Orient and Occident came together to discuss the issue. One of the speakers, Hilmi Ziya Ulken, put the matter very succinctly: "In the East, education was based on the development of the inner life—on spirituality. . . . In the West, education was based on development of the intellect—that is to say, simply on instruction. . . . In an 'autonomous' man, these two activities complete each other and make him into a 'person.' "[48] And the session was concluded by A.R. Wadia, from India, who said:

> What we must aspire to achieve is to create a world in which man becomes conscious of the sacredness of his body as the temple of his soul and the vehicle of his mind, so that he keeps it clean and makes it beautiful and free from disease. His mind has to be enriched with all the wealth of civilizations and his soul made alive to his destiny as man the spirit. Only by aiming at the highest can we attain what is worth attaining, though as practical men we can take only measured steps, inch by inch, in the spirit so beautifully expressed by Goethe: *Ohne Hast, Ohne Rast.*[49]

The holistically educated individual—the new human being—therefore, will not be measured by IQ alone, but by BQ (Body Quotient), EQ (Emotion Quotient), and SQ (Spirit Quotient) as well. The late Russian mystic, G.I. Gurjieff, in his Institute for the Harmonious Development of Man in Fontainebleau, France, thought that there were seven types of human beings. Type one—the Physical Person, type two—the Emotional Person, and type three—the Intellectual Person, were all partial, incomplete, and thus inferior, "asleep," not quite human. Only with type four did one reach the truly human level—an integrated, harmoniously developed human being—with types five through seven denoting further refinements and improvements in capacity and integration. Likewise, in our increasingly interdependent and cross-cultural world, one can well wonder what the dangers of partial, culture-bound education might be.

Conclusions

Up to now we have looked at five more or less culture-based models of the educated person. I emphasize the "more or less" since only the first three—the educated Westerner, the classical Hindu, and the Confucian Chinese—are in any sense pure types. The last two are both intercultural, with Mao building on the ideas and theories of Marx—an adaptation of Occidental concepts to the Orient—and the holistic model borrowing considerably from the "both/and" (vs. the Aristotelian "either/or") approach of the East. What remains now is to suggest some of the implications for the postsecondary educational planner.

First, in an era of increased calls for accountability, educators and their charges need to be clear about the goals of educational programs. Dressel writes: "There must be some clearly defined purposes, objectives, or goals which give direction to the growth of the educational institution and which make it possible to develop a coherent and consistent program with a unity apparent to students, to faculty, and to the clientele generally. The preparation of a statement of purposes which outlines directions of development requires thoughtful consideration of the future as well as critical examination of the past."[50] In a much more recent statement, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching makes a similar point: "Although our intellectual world no longer permits the assured prescription that was appropriate for colonial programs, it nevertheless does permit the emergence of some clear understanding about what colleges intend to accomplish. Articulating these understandings and providing for their continuing reassessment are the responsibilities of those who provide academic leadership for every institution. . . ."[51]

Second, it follows that in an increasingly complex and interdependent world, an education based on a monocultural formulation of the past is no longer adequate nor appropriate. The East-West models of the new socialist individual in China and the holistically educated person in the West are thus hopeful, at the least, in their attempts to transcend a single cultural tradition.

Third, education itself, as Barnes and others have pointed out, is a process which cannot be contained in a single set or type of institution. The "great learning," to borrow Confucius's phrase, takes place throughout this life—spiritists would have us believe that it continues even beyond bodily death. Clearly it is not something to be done totally in any fraction of one's lifetime or in any specific institution. That fractional input, or schooling, can in fact be called the "little learning."

Fourth, to be wholly rather than partially educated is a matter of focus as well as time. Rome wasn't built in a day, yet even Rome was but one city among many. Education for manners, morals, service, physical well-being, general knowledge and expertise, mental/emotional health, and spiritual self-realization are each worthy goals. Without the benefit of a cross-cultural perspective, one simply gets educated along the lines implicitly laid down by one's culture. Yet once the question of basic assumptions and focus is raised, who will decide on the relative priority among these goals? Common sense suggests that they are all desirable and that to be truly educated means significant progress toward attaining each and every one of them.

Fifth, if the leaders of so-called institutions of higher education (Is the attainment of mental health, for example, "lower" education?) reflect, they may realize that our style of learning and teaching, though important, is ultimately partial. Definitions of what it means to be educated can be locally and individually debated, but all will agree that the kind of knowledge universities

emphasize is less than universal. Students, meanwhile, can be encouraged to pursue lifelong learning goals beyond the emphasis and scope of their intellectually oriented alma maters. In short, universal, balanced, integrated learning as well as lifelong learning should become their goal, and we academic planners, like Barnes, should have the foresight and the initiative to set up structures to help them to do so. Otherwise, given recent and not so recent precedents of "the best and brightest," unless education in the future takes account of humanity's complex learning needs in some such way as suggested here, we may have neither education, nor humanity, nor a future.

Notes

1 Clyde Kluckholm and Henry A. Murray, *Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture* (New York: Knopf, 1949), pp. 45, 41.
2 Edward T. Hall, *Beyond Culture* (New York: Anchor Books, 1976), p. 74.
3 Peter Pauper Press, *Zen Buddhism* (Mt. Vernon, N.Y.: 1959), p. 16.
4 Report of the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, 1975-1976, Harvard University, 3.
5 Burton J. Bledstein, "Reassessing General Education," in *Relating Work and Education*, D.W. Vermilye, ed. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977), p. 146.
6 Robert Ulich, *Education in Western Culture* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1965).
7 Paul Nash, Andreas M. Kazamias, and Henry J. Perkinson, *The Educated Man: Studies in the History of Educational Thought* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965). See also Paul Nash, *Models of Man: Explorations in the Western Educational Tradition*, published by Wiley in 1968.
8 Reynold Feldman, "College and the Hereafter: On the Limits of Western Education," an unpublished paper delivered to the Mortar Board Honor Society, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, on February 12, 1968.
9 Paul L. Dressel, *The Undergraduate Curriculum in Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963), pp. 19-20.
10 Robert M. Hutchins, *The New Learning in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936), pp. 51-52.
11 Ibid., p. 53.
12 Ibid., p. 63.
13 Benjamin S. Bloom, ed., *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives (Handbook I: Cognitive Domain)—The Classification of Educational Goals* (New York: D. McKay, 1956).
14 Theodore L. Gross, "How to Kill a College—The Private Papers of a Campus Dean," *Saturday Review* (February 4, 1978), p. 20.
15 Robert Ulich, ed. *Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), p. 4.
16 Ibid., p. 10.
17 Ibid., p. 10.
18 Ibid., pp. 11-12.
19 *The Bhagavad-Gita*, trans. Eliot Deutsch (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968), p. 43.
20 Ibid., pp. 43-46.
21 Ulich, *Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom*, p. 16, verses 47.1-2.
22 Ibid., p. 14.
23 Fitzrof Capra, *The Tao of Physics* (San Francisco: Shambala Press, 1975), p. 102.
24 Ulich, *Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom, p. 16, verse 48.1.*
25 Rena Foy, *The World of Education* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968), p. 15.
26 Ulich, *Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom*, pp. 26-27.
27 Foy, *The World of Education*, p. 15.
28 Ibid.
29 Ibid., pp. 16-19.
30 Ibid., p. 17.
31 Harry M. Lindquist, ed., *Education: Readings in the Processes of Cultural Transmission*(Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1970), p. 80.
32 Philippe Devillers, *Mao*, trans. Tony White (New York: Schocken Books, 1969), p. 280.
33 William Kessen, "The Chinese Paradox," *Yale Alumni Magazine* (February, 1978), p.32.
34 Chiu-San Tsang, *Society, Schools and Progress in China* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1968), p. 308.
35 Quoted by Foy, p. 50.
36 Lindquist, p. 81.
37 Foy, p. 43.
38 Mao Tse-tung, "Bookish Knowledge and Practice" (February 1, 1942), in Jerome Ch'en, *Mao* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969), pp. 101, 103.
39 Stephen Uhalley, Jr., *Mao Tse-tung* (New York: New Viewpoints, 1975), pp. 163-164.
40 Ronald E. Barnes, "An Educator Looks Back from 1996," *The Futurist* (April, 1978), p. 124.
41 Public Law 94-482—October 12, 1976, Title I—Higher Education, Section 131, (2)-(5).
42 "Change in Liberal Education/AIHE, *Matrix/CLE*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (February, 1978), p. 4.
43 Wayne A.R. Leys and P.S.S. Rama Rao, *Gandhi and America's Educational Future: An Inquiry at Southern Illinois University* (Carbondale and Edwardsville, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1969), p. 49.
44 J. Krishnamurti, *Krishnamurti on Education* (New York: Harper and Row, Inc., 1977), p. 92.
45 Harold C. Lyon, Jr., *Learning to Feel-Feeling to Learn: Humanistic Education for the Whole Man* (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1971), pp. 4-5.
46 J. Anthony Paredes and Marcus J. Hepburn, "The Split Brain and the Culture-and-Cognition Paradox," *Current Antrhopology*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (March, 1976), 124.
47 Robert S. DeRopp, *The Master Game: Pathways to Higher Consciousness Beyond the*

Drug Experience (New York: Delacorte Press, 1968), p. 22.

48 Hilmi Ziya Ulken, "The East and the West," *Humanism and Education in East and West,* (UNESCO, 1953), p. 177.

49 A.R. Wadia, "The Concept of Man and the Philosophy of Education in East and West," *Humanism and Education in East and West,* p. 190.

50 Dressel, p. 20.

51 The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, *Missions of the College Curriculum: A Contemporary Review with Suggestions* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977), p. 151.